

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-14. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-14.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to claims 1, 9 and 10 as containing "intended use" functionality language such as "memory unit for storing", association attaching unit for attaching"... and "a second dictionary for storing". Amendments were made to claims 1, 9 and 10 to clarify the language. However, it seems as though the Examiner does not having a good understanding that an "element in a claim for a combination may expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof". The language being objected to by the Examiner is functional language drafted in accordance with the permitted manner of reciting elements in a claim as per 35 USC §112, sixth paragraph. The Examiner's attention is directed to 35 USC §112, sixth paragraph. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. Amendments were made to claim 9 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-6 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 3-6 and 9 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 3-6 and 9 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 3-6 and 9 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Claims 1-9 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

This rejection is traversed with respect to claims 1-9. Claims 1-9 are clearly directed to statutory subject matter, specifically a machine, in that claims 1-9 are directed to an information processor (computer) having at least a memory. The machine as recited in claims 1-9 are illustrated, for example, in Fig. 1 wherein a CPU (processor) 101 executes various programs by processing data in memory 108.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §101 rejection of claims 1-9 is respectfully requested since claims 1-9 are directed to statutory subject matter, namely a machine, in accordance with 35 USC §101.

With respect to claim 14, amendments were made to so as to more clearly recite that claim 14 is directed to an article of manufacture specifically, a program stored on a storage medium, wherein the program is executable by a computer.

Therefore, claim 14 is directed to statutory subject matter, specifically an article of manufacture.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §101 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Kantrowitz (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,140); claims 4-6 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantrowitz in view of O'Dell (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,659) and further in view of Sukehiro (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205671); claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantrowitz in view of Komissarchik (U.S. Patent No. 5,799,276); and claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantrowitz in view of Hlava (U.S. Patent No. 6,898,586). These rejections are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-14 are not taught or suggested by Kantrowitz, O'Dell, Sukehiro, Komissarchik and Hlava whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to recite that the present invention is directed to an information processor and program being executed by the information processor which is used to extract low frequency data in order to analyze the low frequency data.

Further, according to the present invention the information processor includes a memory for storing multiple data, an attribute attaching unit for extracting data possessing a common word or term among the stored data as

high frequency information and attaching common attributes to the extracted data, and an analysis unit for analyzing the data.

According to the present invention the analysis unit analyzes data with no attributes which is low frequency data by using a negative word dictionary.

Thus, as per the present invention low frequency data is extracted so as to be analyzed since low frequency is an important source of information for accumulating risk management knowledge. Thus, according to the present invention the attribute attaching unit serves to distinguish high frequency data from low frequency data and the analysis unit analyzes the low frequency data using a negative word dictionary. According to the present invention the high frequency data can be extracted by the thesaurus browsing function because if there is sufficient data among common words or terms, then it can be construed that they are similar data and as such are high frequency data.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Kantrowitz, O'Dell, Sukehiro, Komissarchik or Hlava whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Kantrowitz which is the primary reference used by the Examiner simply discloses a feature of separating high frequency data from low frequency data in order to analyze a low frequency data. However, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Kantrowitz or for that matter, any of the other

references of record, namely O'Dell, Sukehiro, Komissarchik or Hlava, that an attribute attaching unit is provided for extracting data possessing a common word or term among the storage data as high frequency data and attaching common attributes to the extracted data and analysis unit for analyzing the data such that data with no attributes which is low frequency data can be analyzed using a negative word dictionary as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Thus, Kantrowitz, O'Dell, Sukehiro, Komissarchik and Hlava each fails to teach or suggest an attribute attaching unit for extracting data possessing a common word or term among the stored data as high frequency data and attaching common attributes to the extracted data as recited in the claims.

Further, Kantrowitz, O'Dell, Sukehiro, Komissarchik and Hlava each fails to teach or suggest an analysis unit for analyzing the data, wherein the analysis unit analyzes data with no attributes which is low frequency data by using a negative word dictionary as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since each of Kantrowitz, O'Dell, Sukehiro, Komissarchik and Hlava fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in the claims, combining one or more of these references in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 and 14 as being anticipated by Kantrowitz, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 4-6 and 10-13 as being unpatentable over Kantrowitz in view of O'Dell in view of Sukehiro, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 8 as being unpatentable over Kantrowitz in view of Komissarchik and the

35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 9 as being unpatentable over Komissarchik in view of Hlava is respectfully requested.


The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-14.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-14 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (501.42942X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120